

FORENSIC ANALYSIS OF PROCEDURAL SUPPRESSION

U.S. COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE ELEVENTH CIRCUIT

DOCKETS ANALYZED: 25-10858, 25-10862, 25-11120, 25-11182, 25-11183, 25-11254, 25-11752

Date of Analysis: July 18, 2025

SUMMARY OVERVIEW

This forensic brief provides a consolidated review of all known Eleventh Circuit docket activity across seven related appeals filed by Appellant Mario Mirabal. The analysis identifies substantial evidence of procedural suppression, docket mischaracterization, retroactive denials, and omission of critical filings in violation of Rule 27(d), the Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure, and due process norms.

KEY FINDINGS

1. Patterned "NO ACTION" Denials of Rule 27 Motions Without Judicial Panel Review

In five out of seven dockets, Emergency Rule 27(d) motions were docketed and met with a nearly immediate “no action” denial (within 2-4 minutes).

No indication is given that these were reviewed by a judicial panel or judge.

Reason cited: "This appeal is closed"—despite the fact that the motions directly challenge the legitimacy of that closure on

jurisdictional and structural fraud grounds.

Example: 25-10858 Entry 39 issued within 2 minutes of Rule 27(d) filing. No judicial signature or reasoning.

2. Rule 27(d) Motion Missing from Multiple Dockets

The same Rule 27(d) Motion filed in all seven cases (July 18, 2025) appears only in 25-10858.

It is entirely missing from dockets 25-10862, 25-11120, 25-11182, 25-11183, 25-11254, and 25-11752.

There is no deficiency notice, no docketing error, and no denial order—indicating either intentional suppression or clerical concealment.

3. Constructive Consolidation Ignored, Rulings Recycled Across Cases

Orders denying motions in one docket (e.g., 25-11182 Entry 31) appear to rely on boilerplate language reused across multiple dockets without adjusting motion references.

These rulings fail to acknowledge that motions like 27(d) and 60(d)(3) are distinct, jurisdictional, and require individualized analysis.

4. En Banc Addenda Docketed but Silently Disregarded

Across all reviewed dockets, Appellant filed formal En Banc Addenda in support of judicial reassessment.

These were:

Docketed

Not ruled upon individually

Not referenced in “no action” notices

Omitted entirely from denials—suggesting they were never read by a panel

5. Retroactive Closure Weaponized to Block Emergency Filings

In all relevant dockets, Emergency Rule 27(d) and Rule 60(d)(3) motions were denied based on case status being "closed."

However, the motions themselves challenge the legitimacy of that closure, citing:

Misrouted filings

Doctored PACER entries

Patterned clerk suppression of jurisdictional evidence

PROCEDURAL VIOLATIONS IDENTIFIED

Violation Description

Rule 27(d) obstruction Motions invoking structural suppression were dismissed by clerks without panel review

Due process failure Substantive motions never reached the judges assigned to case

Docket erasure Filings are completely missing from 5 out of 7 case dockets

Misuse of closure doctrine Used as a shield to block motions that expose fraudulent dismissal pattern

CONCLUSION

The totality of the procedural anomalies confirmed through docket analysis shows a systematic pattern of suppression. Emergency and jurisdictional filings by Appellant Mario Mirabal were mishandled, omitted, or rejected without judicial review in violation of Rule 27(d), Rule 60(d)(3), and constitutional norms. This supports the ongoing claim that appellate procedures were misused to conceal structural fraud and to frustrate lawful access to the Court.

Prepared by:

July 18, 2025

Mario Mirabal